UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/712,073	11/13/2003	Beth E. Drees	007262-30 US	7922

36234 7590 10/28/2009

THE MCCALLUM LAW FIRM, P. C.
685 BRIGGS STREET
PO BOX 929
ERIE, CO 80516

EXAMINER	
COUNTS, GARY W	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1641	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/28/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/712,073	DREES ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	GARY W. COUNTS	1641	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07 July 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-4,7,8,10-13,32-34 and 38* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-4,7,8,10-13,32-34 and 38* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Status of the claims

Applicant's amendment and response filed 07/07/09 is acknowledged and has been entered. Claims 1, 33, and 34 have been amended. Claim 14 has been cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1-4, 7, 8, 10-13, 32-34 and 38 are pending and are under examination.

Withdrawn Rejections

All rejections of claims not reiterated herein, have been withdrawn.

The rejections of claim 14 are now moot in light of Applicant's cancellation of the claims.

Enablement

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Enablement requires that the specification teach those in the art to make and use the invention without undue experimentation. The factors that must be considered in determining undue experimentation are set forth in *In re Wands* USPTQ2d 14000. Factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure would require undue experimentation include (1) the nature of the invention, (2) the state of the prior art, (3) the predictability or lack thereof in the art, (4) the amount of direction or guidance present, (5) the presence or absence of working examples, (6) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (7) the relative skill of those in the art, and (8) the breadth of the claims.

The instant claims are directed to a method of screening a disease caused alteration of a lipid phosphatase comprising the step of using the lipid phosphates assay method of claim 1 to detect changes in the lipid phosphatase activity in bodily tissue, blood or serum samples of a patient with a disease, whereby detection of a change from normal levels indicates a disease caused alteration of a lipid phosphatase. The specification on page 2 under the section entitled background of the invention, the applicant discloses that lipid phosphatases and alterations in their activity levels are implicated in a variety of signaling pathways that are important in regulation of insulin sensitivity and allergic and immune responses, and which are altered in carcinogenesis. The specification on page 8, lines 21-26 discloses that the signaling pathways involving these lipid modifying enzymes are often perturbed in the events leading to disease, particularly in non-insulin dependent diabetes mellitus and cancer. The specification further discloses that the tools developed in the present invention have significant value for research and in diagnostic applications. The specification on page 9, lines 27-29

discloses that the lipid phosphatase assay is a screening method for disease detection, i.e. Cowden's disease, and a molecule for treating such disease by detection of alteration of lipid phosphatase activity. The specification on page 10, lines 13-15 discloses that the lipid phosphatase assay can be used as a screening method for detection of a disease by detection of a predetermined level of the $PI(3,4)P_2$ or $PI(4,5)P_2$ lipid. The applicant has not disclosed how one skilled in the art can use just single determination of a change of lipid phosphatase activity and have it correlated with only disease. The specification does not provide working examples, controls or standards or guidance on how a change in lipid phosphatase indicates only disease caused alteration of a lipid phosphatase. Komazawa et al (Nature Medicine, Vol 10, No. 11, 2004, pgs 1208-1215) teaches that the expression levels of PTEN protein (lipid phosphatase) are significantly increased in obesity (e.g. abstract, p. 1211) and decreased in exposure to cold (abstract, p. 1211). Bhashyam et al., (Am J Physiol Heart Circ Physiol, Vol 293 pgs H3063 –H3071) teaches the increased expression of PTEN (lipid phosphatase) in cardiac muscle in older dogs but not in skeletal muscle (e.g. p. H3067) Bhashyam et al also teaches that increased PTEN (lipid phosphatase) activity in the hearts of young dogs with dilated cardiomyopathy (e.g. p. H3068). Further, it is unclear if the change of activity involves both increases and decreases of lipid phosphatase is indicative of a disease caused alteration of a lipid phosphatase. The specification on page 4, lines 1-2 disclose that ablation of SHIP1 in transgenic mice leads to chronic hyperplasia and increased proliferation and survival of hematopoetic cells. One of ordinary skill in the art would understand that this is a decreased lipid

phosphatase activity. The specification on page 4, lines 33-34 discloses that a loss of PTEN activity results in accumulation of $PI(3,4,5)P_3$. Thus, it appears that only decreases of lipid phosphatase may be correlated with disease. However, the specification does not provide for differentiating lipid phosphatase activity in disease from that of age, temperature or obesity. Such is not seen as sufficient to support the breath of the claims and one skilled in the art cannot practice the claimed invention without undue experimentation, because in order to establish if the lipid phosphatase activity indicates a disease caused alteration of lipid phosphatase, one skilled in the art would not be able to differentiate if the lipid phosphatase alteration is caused by obesity, age, temperature or disease, and one skilled would not have a high level of predictability.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-4, 7, 8, and 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1, lines 5 and 6 is ambiguous because it is unclear how a change in concentration of the lipid product is determined, since line 8 only provides indication of the "presence" of the product lipid.

Claim 1 is vague and indefinite because it is unclear how an actual change of the substrate lipid and lipid detector protein are determined absent a known baseline level for both elements.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

6. Claims 1-4, 7, 10, 11, 32-34 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Dowler et al (WO 02/12276).

Dowler et al disclose methods for detecting or quantifying enzyme activity such as lipid phosphatases (p. 34 & pages 130-135). Dowler et al disclose exposing a protein (lipid detector protein) that binds specifically to product lipids. Dowler et al discloses that the protein comprise a PH domain (lipid recognition motif) which is specific for product lipids (p. 130). Dowler et al disclose exposing the protein (lipid detector protein) comprising the PH domain to substrate lipid and sample and determining if the protein bound to a product lipid. Dowler et al disclose that the PH domain may be in the form of a fusion protein or that the PH domain may be tagged (p.130 & p.132). Dowler et al disclose that the method can comprise the substrate lipid in free solution (p. 133-134). Dowler et al disclose that prior to contacting that a microtiter plate surface can be coated with lipid substrate that comprises a chromophore

(p. 131). Dowler et al disclose that the method may be used for making real time measurement throughout the course of the reaction (p. 132, lines 12-20). Dowler et al disclose that a FRET assay (fluorgenic assay) can be used to determine the enzyme activity. Dowler et al disclose that the substrate lipid can be immobilized or free in solution. Dowler et al disclose that the substrate lipids can be $PI(3,4,5)P_3$ or $PI(4,5)P_2$ and the product lipid PI(4)P (p. 131). Dowler et al disclose that the method may be used to identify modulators of lipid phosphatase activity (p. 34, lines 21-28) by measuring lipid phosphatase activity in the presence and absence of a compound. Dowler et al discloses that the sample can be from a diseased patient.

With respect to the recitation "wherein a change in concentration for any of the above substances between steps (a) and (b) indicates that said product lipid is present in said solution". Dowler et al teaches determining the level of activity and teaches the method may be used in real time measurement throughout the course of the reaction and it is inherent that when the enzyme activity reacts upon the substrate lipid that there is an increase in the amount of product lipid in the assay. Thus, Dowler et al reads on the instantly recited claim.

With respect to claim 32 as instantly recited. The recitation "to detect changes in the lipid phasphatase activity" are intended use of the method of claim 1 and since Dowler et al teaches every active method step of claim 1. Dowler et al reads on claim 32. Regarding the interpretive "whereby" clause recited in claim 32 ("whereby detection of a change from normal levels indicates a disease caused alteration of a lipid phosphatase", the clause does not recite any additional active method steps, but simply

states a characterization or conclusion of the results to those steps. Therefore, the "whereby" clause is not considered to further limit the method defined by the claim and has not been given weight in construing the claims. See Texas Instruments, Inc. v. International Trade Comm., 988 F.2d 1165, 1171, 26 USPQ2d 1018, 1023 (Fed Cir. 1993) ("A whereby clause that merely states the result of the limitations in the claim adds nothing to the patentability or substance of the claim."). See also Minton v. National Assoc. of Securities Dealers, Inc., 336 F.3d 1373, 1381, 67 USPQ2d 1614, 1620 (Fed. Cir. 2003) ("A whereby clause in a method claim is not given weight when it simply expresses the intended result of a process step positively recited.").

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

9. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

10. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dowler et al (WO 02/12276) in view of Goueli et al (US 6,720,162).

See above for the teachings of Dowler et al.

Dowler et al differ from the instant invention in failing to teach the plate is coated with streptavidin.

Goueli et al teaches method for determining lipid phosphatase activity. Goueli et al disclose coating a plate with streptavidin used in assays for lipid phosphatase activity (col 3 & col 9). Goueli et al disclose that this provides for an easy means to separate the products of an enzymatic reaction from unreacted reactant, enzyme and other nonproduct ingredients of a reaction solution (col 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate coated streptavidin and biotin systems as taught by Goueli et al into the methods of Dowler et al because Goueli et al teaches that this

provides for an easy means to separate the products of an enzymatic reaction from unreacted reactant, enzyme and other nonproduct ingredients of a reaction solution. Further, the use of streptavidin to immobilize reactants of assays is very well known in the art.

11. Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dowler et al in view of Taylor et al (Analytical Biochemistry, 295, 122-126, 2001).

See above for the teachings of Dowler et al.

Dowler et al differs from the instant invention in failing to teach the lipid phosphatase is myotubularin or PTEN. Dowler et al also fails to specifically state that the sample has additional lipids.

Taylor et al disclose assays for determining phosphoinositide phosphatases such as myotubularin and PTEN which act on phosphoitidylinositol phosphates in samples . Taylor et al disclose that the sample can have different lipids. Taylor et al teaches that these enzymes are studied to better understand their role in the synthesis, breakdown, and interconversion of inositiol lipids.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate or determine myotubularin and PTEN activity as taught by Taylor et al into the method of Dowler et al because Dowler et al is generic with respect to the lipid phosphatases to be determined and Taylor et al teaches that the determination of myotubularin and PTEN which act on phosphoitidylinositol

phosphates in samples provides for a better understanding of their role in the synthesis, breakdown, and interconversion of inositiol lipids.

Double Patenting

12. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

13. Claims 1-4, 7, 8, and 10-12 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-17 of copending Application No. 10/850,833. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because each teaches assaying a lipid product of a lipid phosphatase by exposing a lipid recognition protein to a sample, and both inventions require a lipid substrate and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the claims of 10/850,833 requiring quantifying the

lipid product would also encompass determining the presence of a lipid product of a lipid phosphatase as recited in current application 10/712,073.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments filed 07/07/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

112 first paragraph rejections

Applicant argues that the instant specification provides sufficient examples and guidance related to.

This is not found persuasive because the applicant has not provided sufficient examples and specific guidance and applicant has not specifically addressed the issues presented in the 112 first rejections filed 01/07/09. Therefore, for reasons stated above and in the previous office action the 112 first rejections are maintained.

112 2nd paragraph rejections

Applicant states that amended claim 1 particularly points out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant states that Examiner has stated that, "it is unclear how a change in concentration of the lipid product is determined,". Applicant argues that amended claim 1 recites "a plate-based assay to determine".

This is not found persuasive because the Examiner has not questioned how a concentration is determined but rather has questioned how a change is determined. The claim currently recites determining a change in concentration (lines 5-6) and then further only requires indicating the presence of lipid product (line 8). The claim is confusing because it appears that a step or elements of the claim are missing to determine a change. In order to determine a change it would appear that a concentration would already have to be determined and then a comparison of a subsequent concentration to the first concentration would have to occur to determine a change. The further recitation within claim 1 only requiring the presence of a product lipid causes further confusion because now it is unclear if applicant is determining a change in product lipid or if applicant is only determining the presence of product lipid. Therefore, for reasons stated above the 112 2nd rejections of claim 1 are maintained.

102 rejections

Applicant argues that the Dowler reference teaches a method here a substrate lipid is incubated with an appropriate enzyme in the presence of a PH domain fused green fluorescent protein (applicant directs Examiners attention to p. 131, lines 24-28). Applicant further states that Dowler does not disclose exposing a lipid detector protein to a solution containing a substrate lipid and lipid phosphatase.

This is not found persuasive because the Examiner has not relied upon the section of page 131, lines 24-28 solely (see rejections above and in previous office actions. For the reasons stated above Dowler reads on the instantly recited claims.

Applicant argues that Dowler does not mention PI(4,5)P2, or PI and specifically does not disclose binding of PI(3,4,5)P3.

This is not found persuasive because as stated above and in the previous office actions Dowler specifically teaches the substrate lipids can be PI(3,4,5)P3 or PI(4,5)P2 (p. 131 Dowler). Further, with respect to the binding of PI(3,4,5)P3 as currently argued by the Applicant. It is noted that binding to the PI(3,4,5)P3 is not recited in the current claims.

Applicant further argues that in order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, it must be shown that each and every one of the claim limitations was suggested or taught by the prior art relied on. This argument is not found persuasive because the argument is not on point. The 102 rejection is based on anticipation not obviousness. Further, as stated above Dowler teaches each and every limitation currently recited and therefore Dowler reads on the instantly recited claims.

103 rejections

Applicant argues that the Examiner has mischaracterized Goueli and states that the Goueli reference described lipid kinase and phosphatase assays where the lipid kinase and phosphatase assays where the lipid substrate is modified, i.e. biotinylated or immobilized and is detected radioactively which requires a separation step. The liquid phase assay in the Goueli column 3 is also liquid during the enzymatic conversion, but detection still requires radioactivity and separation. The applicant argues that the

claimed lipid phosphase assay always detect the lipid product, use nonbiotinylated/mobile substrate and do no require radioactivity.

This is not found persuasive because the instantly recited claims do not recite nonbiotinylated/mobile substrate and do not exclude the use of radioactivity. Further, the Examiner has not relied upon Goueli for teaching the recited method but rather has relied upon Goueli for teaching that it is known and conventional in the art to incorporate streptavidin and biotin systems into assays and for teaching the advantages of using such a system and since Goueli teaches analogous art and the advantages of using such systems one or ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to incorporate such systems into the method of Dowler et al and one would also have a reasonable expectation of success.

Applicant argues that the assay of Dowler is very different for the assay of the invention. This is not found persuasive because of reasons stated above the Dowler reads on the currently recited claims. Applicant further appears to argue that the reference of Taylor fails to cure the deficiencies of the Dowler reference. This is not found persuasive because of reasons stated above that Dowler reads on the instantly recited claims. Thus, the combination of Dowler and Taylor et al is considered appropriate and still reads on the instantly recited claims.

Conclusion

15. No claims are allowed.

16. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to GARY W. COUNTS whose telephone number is (571)272-0817. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Shibuya can be reached on (571) 272-0806. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/ Gary W. Counts/
Examiner, Art Unit 1641

/GAILENE R. GABEL/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1641

10/24/09